

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed October 15, 2008 which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 remain in this application, where claims 1, 4 and 7 are independent.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0204073 (Yanosy) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161934 (Johnson). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-10 are patentable over Yanosy and Johnson for at least the following reasons.

Yanosy is directed to a mobile device 10 that includes a microprocessor 100, a device profile 101 stored in a local memory 102, a device application 103 and a virtual operating system 104. In operation, the mobile device application 103 requests device augmentation. The request is forwarded from the virtual operating

system 104 to a broker 123 that determines an appropriate sharable resource, to be provided by a selected sharable network resource provider, by comparing the device profile 101 with a directory of sharable resources stored in a knowledge base 126. Thus, any access to a remote service provider is in response to a service augmentation.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 4 and 7, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

providing an application interface which enables access to a virtual local storage by an application running on the user device by processing a request from the application to store auxiliary data associated with the application in the virtual local storage, and, when a storage request is received, having the auxiliary data stored on the remote server via the network.

Storing data on a remote server in response to a request to store data from an application running on the user device is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Yanosy. Rather, Yanosy merely discloses to provide access to a remote service provider is in response to a service augmentation. Johnson is cited to allegedly


show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Yanosy.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 4 and 7 are allowable. In additions, claims 2-3, 5-6 and 8-10 are allowable at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1, 4 and 7.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
December 8, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101